



**Report to the Legislature: *Statewide Assistance in the  
Preparation and Implementation of Professional  
Development Plans***  
M.G.L. Chapter 71 Section 38Q  
June 2009

**Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**  
75 Pleasant Street , Malden, MA 02148  
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)



This document was prepared by the  
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

**Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Members**

Ms. Maura Banta, Chair, Melrose  
Ms. Harneen Chernow, Jamaica Plain  
Mr. Gerald Chertavian, Cambridge  
Mr. Andrew "AJ" Fajnzylber, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Brookline  
Dr. Thomas E. Fortmann, Lexington  
Ms. Beverly Holmes, Springfield  
Dr. Jeff Howard, Reading  
Ms. Ruth Kaplan, Brookline  
Dr. Dana Mohler-Faria, Bridgewater  
Mr. Paul Reville, Secretary of Education, Worcester  
Dr. Sandra L. Stotsky, Brookline  
Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner  
and Secretary to the Board

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public.

We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex or sexual orientation.

Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148 781-338-6105.

© 2009 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

*Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."*

*This document printed on recycled paper.*

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906  
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370  
[www.doe.mass.edu](http://www.doe.mass.edu)





Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner

# Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

---

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-4906

Telephone: (781) 338-3000  
TTY: N.E.T. Relay 1-800-439-2370

June 2009

Dear Members of the General Court:

I am pleased to submit this *Report to the Legislature: Statewide Assistance in the Development and Implementation of Professional Development Plans* pursuant to M.G.L. chapter 71 section 38Q that reads in part:

*“the commissioner of education of the commonwealth shall prepare each year a plan for providing statewide assistance in the preparation and implementation of professional development plans...”*

In FY09, as in years past, the Legislature allocated funds to enable the Department to provide high quality professional development through grant-funded activities. The Department’s predominantly grant-funded professional development opportunities use a combination of state and/or federal funds. Currently, the Department’s assistance to districts in the development of local professional development plans is largely limited to review, and approval of proposed plans consistent with grant funding priorities. These approved plans are typically targeted to particular schools rather than the district as a whole and, for the most part, are directed toward improving educator practice in the highest need communities across the Commonwealth.

While many of the Department’s offices provide high quality grant-funded professional development, the professional development activities of the Center for Curriculum and Instruction, the Center for Leadership and School Redesign, the Center for School and District Assistance, and the Center for Special Programs are highlighted as examples of the Department’s professional development offerings. The report provides a summary of the professional development opportunities offered in each of these centers.

As relevant as the Department’s professional development opportunities are, however, they vary across disciplines and are largely directed to the highest need communities in the state. Resources also impact the extent to which the Department is able to provide direct assistance to districts in designing professional development plans. Currently, this assistance is limited to those districts that receive state or federal grants. The Department does not have the capacity to establish professional development partnerships with all of the districts and schools that are not meeting Annual Yearly Progress goals.

This report recommends that the Department's new Center for Curriculum and Instruction take responsibility for convening a steering committee composed of representatives from all units engaged in professional development activities to redesign a statewide professional development plan that will be part of the state's comprehensive system of support. As a catalyst for discussion, this report offers an initial draft of a possible FY10 state professional plan including articulation of the elements of a statewide system of professional development and state, district, and external provider roles and responsibilities in effective professional development. Of particular importance is the call to mobilize a wide-range of external partners including institutions of higher education, consultants, collaboratives, and other organizations with professional development expertise that are interested in collaborating with the Department and districts to deliver high quality professional development across the Commonwealth. Massachusetts will benefit from coherence in its professional development system in order to achieve a unity of purpose in state, district, and individual educator plans.

In FY10, I propose to revisit the state professional development plan and submit a revised plan for approval to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. Updating the state professional development plan requires the input and collaboration of many of the Department's offices that directly provide professional development, assist districts in the implementation of local professional development plans, and award Professional Development Points (PDPs) for re-certification and advancement.

If you would like to discuss this further, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  
Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

**Statewide Assistance in the Preparation and Implementation  
of  
Professional Development Plans**

**Table of Contents**

<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Recommendations for the FY10 State Professional Development Plan</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>III. Initial Draft of the FY10 State Professional Development Plan</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>IV. Budgetary Request to Consolidate the Literacy Lines</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>V. Attachment 1: Examples of Professional Development and Assistance</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>VI. Attachment 2: M.G.L Chapter 71 Section 38Q</b>	<b>29</b>

## I. Introduction

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education respectfully submits this Report to the Legislature on: *Statewide Assistance in the Preparation and Implementation of Professional Development Plans* pursuant to **MGL Chapter 71, Section 38Q (last paragraph)**:

*“the commissioner of education of the commonwealth shall prepare each year a plan for providing statewide assistance in the preparation and implementation of professional development plans. The plan shall include data that demonstrates, statewide and by school district, the types of professional development provided for educators who work with limited English proficient students. The commissioner shall consult with the board of higher education in developing said plan. This plan shall evaluate the feasibility of obtaining assistance from institutions of higher education and private service providers. The plan shall be submitted to the board of education for approval. A copy of said plan shall be submitted to the joint committee on education, arts, and humanities of the general court....”*

The most recent professional development plan that is posted on the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s (Department’s) web site highlights the state’s 2001 priorities for professional development and describes the responsibilities of the state, school districts, and professional development providers for assisting districts in the preparation and implementation of professional development plans consistent with statewide initiatives. As referenced in Chapter 71, Section 38Q of the Massachusetts General Laws, professional development plans include training on curriculum frameworks, pre-referral services within regular education, and training for teachers including those who work with students with limited English proficiency. It is the effective implementation of standards-based and research-informed instructional practices that contributes substantially to the likely success of Massachusetts students in achieving proficiency on the state’s standards-based assessments and demonstrating readiness for postsecondary education and the demands of the 21<sup>st</sup> century work force.

In FY10, the Department proposes to update the state professional development plan and submit the revised plan for approval to the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. Updating the state professional development plan requires the input of many of the Department’s offices that directly provide professional development, assist districts in the implementation of local professional development plans, and award Professional Development Points (PDPs) for re-certification and advancement. This report recommends that the Department’s new Center for Curriculum and Instruction take responsibility for convening a steering committee composed of representatives from all units engaged in professional development activities to redesign a statewide professional development plan that will be part of the state’s comprehensive system of support. As a catalyst for discussion, this report offers an initial draft of a possible FY10 state professional plan including articulation of the elements of a statewide system of professional development and state, district, and external provider roles and responsibilities in effective professional development. Of particular importance is the call to mobilize a wide-range of external partners including institutions of higher education, consultants, collaboratives, and other organizations with professional development expertise that are interested in collaborating with the Department and districts to deliver high quality professional development across the Commonwealth.

## Background

In FY09, as in years past, the Legislature allocated funds to enable the Department to provide high quality professional development through grant-funded activities. The Department's predominantly grant-funded professional development opportunities use a combination of state and/or federal funds. Currently, the Department's assistance to districts in the development of local professional development plans is largely limited to review, and approval of proposed plans consistent with grant funding priorities. These approved plans are typically targeted to particular schools rather than the district as a whole and, for the most part, are directed toward improving educator practice in the highest need communities across the Commonwealth.

While many of the Department's offices provide high quality grant-funded professional development, the professional development activities of the Center for Curriculum and Instruction, the Center for Leadership and School Redesign, the Center for School and District Assistance, and the Center for Special Programs are highlighted as examples of the Department's professional development offerings. The following is a summary of the professional development opportunities under the leadership of each of these centers. For a more detailed description of these professional development opportunities, please see Attachment 1.

## Center for Curriculum and Instruction

### Literacy

- The Center for Curriculum and Instruction, Office of Literacy oversees the state-funded John Silber Early Literacy Initiative (Silber) and the Targeted Tutorial Literacy Program. It also manages the federal No Child Left Behind Reading First project and the Massachusetts Middle and High School Reading Initiative funded by special education. The Bay State Reading Institute is a state-funded literacy initiative that is independent of the Office of Literacy's oversight. The literacy professional development is designed to be scaled-up and could be offered to a larger group of districts as part of a statewide system of support. For additional information on these projects, please see Attachment 1.
  - The **John Silber Early Literacy Initiative**, state budget line-item 7030-1003, was allocated \$3,236,158 after the FY09 9C cuts. Of this, \$2,868,658 supports K-3 reading instruction in 31 high-need schools in 13 districts. Most of these schools are 2007 Commonwealth Priority schools that are identified for corrective action or restructuring in the aggregate for English language arts at grade 3 or those identified for restructuring based on subgroups at grade 3. These schools serve approximately 6,000 K-3 students.
  - The **Targeted Tutorial Literacy Program**, state budget line-item 7030-1005 was allocated \$2,235,705 after the FY09 9C cuts. This funding supports the training of 359 Reading Recovery teachers and the partial salary support of 66 of these teachers. The funding supports tutorial reading intervention for 2,872 grade 1 students who are having difficulty learning to read.
  - The **No Child Left Behind Reading First** project is now in its sixth year of funding. The Department expects that 2008-2009 will be the final year of Reading First funding. In 2008-2009, 48 high-need schools in 23 high-need districts are the recipients of Reading First grants to implement evidence-based reading instruction for approximately 13,000 K-3 students. Of the FY09 grant of \$5.5 million, a maximum of \$715,000 is

available for statewide and regional professional development provided by the Department.

- The **Massachusetts Middle and High School Reading Initiative** is funded by special education. In FY 09, this initiative received \$639,040 to assist 916 middle and high school educators in 60 schools in their implementation of the Massachusetts Secondary Literacy Framework and to engage leadership teams in a statewide professional development network.
- The **Bay State Reading Institute**, state budget line-item 7010-0020, provides reading and principal coaching and professional development in 18 K-6 schools. After the FY09 9C cuts, the Bay State Reading Institute received \$1,192,800. The majority of this funding supports school-based coaching with the balance for professional development. This initiative is independent of the Center on Curriculum and Instruction, Office of Literacy's work.

### **Mathematics and Science**

- The Center for Curriculum and Instruction, Office for Mathematics, Science, and Technology/Engineering oversees the Mathematics and Science Teacher Content-Based Professional Development state budget line-item, 7061-9804. After the FY09 9C cuts, \$486,227 was allocated to support primarily the Massachusetts Intel Mathematics Initiative (an 80-hour math course for K-8 teachers) and with additional funding sources, the 2008 Teacher Professional Development Institutes (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/cinstitute/08/>) that provided content training in mathematics and science for over 500 educators across the state. The mathematics and science professional development is designed to be scaled-up and could be offered regionally as part of a statewide system of support. For additional information, see the 2009 Report to the Legislature: Mathematics and Science Teacher Content-Based Professional Development at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0209mathsci.doc> .
- **The Professional Development Institute Program** is a statewide program that has been offered by the Department for 14 years. The PD Institutes are offered in partnership with a high-need district and a high quality provider (in some cases from higher education and in others a private or professional organization or cultural institution.)with strong content and pedagogical expertise in their field. Each summer the department funds approximately 24-31 (based on available funding) graduate level courses, cost-free to educators. Each year approximately 500-600 math and science, English language learner (ELL), Special Education and Title I teachers, coaches, paraprofessionals, and administrators participate in these courses. Each course is 45 hours of direct instruction and an additional 10-15 hours that support implementation of the course content into the participants' classrooms.
- **Massachusetts Intel Mathematics Initiative (MIMI)**. In the fall of 2006, the Department entered into a partnership with the Intel Corporation, the UMass Medical School's Regional Science Resource Center, and University of Vermont mathematician Dr. Kenneth Gross. Through this partnership the Massachusetts Intel Mathematics Initiative (MIMI) was launched in the summer of 2007, offering 150 elementary and middle school math teachers an 80-hour course focused on K-8 foundational content (e.g., arithmetical operations, proportional reasoning, linear equations). This first cohort of participants drew from high-need districts including Boston, Springfield and New

Bedford. Participants finished the course in the fall of 2007 and met regularly throughout the school year in mathematical learning communities to extend their learning and improve instructional practice. An additional 175 teachers completed the intensive 80-hour mathematics course in the fall of 2008. Worcester has been added to the original districts so that the three largest urban districts in the Commonwealth are participating in the initiative. MIMI Initiative information is posted online:

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/omste/news07/mimi.html>.

- The Office for Mathematics and Science also manages the federal **No Child Left Behind Act: Title IIB Mathematics and Science Partnership Program**. This competitive program awards 3-year grants to partnerships of higher education STEM departments with high-need school districts. These partnerships offer a course or a series of content-based courses to teachers in the partner districts. Each course is a graduate level course of at least 45 hours; teachers are pre/post tested for content knowledge gain, and in some partnerships the series of courses lead to the attainment of a Master's Degree. During FY08, approximately 45 courses were offered and educators from more than 40 mainly high-need districts participated. Last year, the program served approximately 500 K-12 math and science teachers.

### **English Language Acquisition**

- The Center on Curriculum and Instruction, Office of English Language Acquisition oversees the English Language Acquisition Professional Development state budget line-item 7027-1004. After the 9C cuts in FY09, \$468,161 was appropriated to support professional development for educators of English language learners implementing sheltered English immersion and teaching English language acquisition. This funding supported the professional development of approximately 3,500 teachers. The funding also supported the MELT initiative, preparing an additional 40 licensed teachers to become qualified English as second language (ESL) teachers. Finally, this funding has also enabled the continued development and implementation of a professional development initiative on content-based ESL curriculum development and instruction for approximately 50 classroom (both ESL and content) teachers representing 18 districts, during 2008-2009. For further information, see the 2009 Report to the Legislature: English Language Acquisition Professional Development at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/report/0509elapd.pdf> .
- The Center on Curriculum and Instruction, Office of English Language Acquisition manages a federally funded project that used \$59,486 in No Child Left Behind Act: Title III funds in FY09 to support districts in their development of an ESL curriculum. In 2008, 65 teachers from 12 different district teams participated in this ESL curriculum development project.

### **Gifted and Talented**

- The Center on Curriculum and Instruction, Office of Humanities oversees the Gifted and Talented Education state budget line-item 7061-9621. After the FY09 9C cuts, \$507,749 was allocated to support four Gifted and Talented Resource Centers comprised of a consortium of a district with established Gifted and Talented services, a college or university, and optionally, cultural institutions.

## Center for Leadership and School Redesign

### Educator Leadership

- The Center for Leadership and School Redesign, Office of Educator Leadership oversees the National Institute for School Leadership (NISL) instructional leadership training for principals and superintendents, state budget line-item 7061-9411. After the FY09 9C cuts, \$980,000 was allocated for leadership academics for the training of 445 principals and superintendents in 13 districts. For additional details on additional leadership professional development initiatives see the 2009 Report to the Legislature: School Leadership Academies Training Initiative at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0409leadership.pdf> .

## Center for School and District Assistance

### School and District Assistance

- The Center for School and District Assistance oversees state-funded School and District Assistance funding as well as the federal No Child Left Behind Title I School Improvement funding. For further information, please see the 2009 Report to the Legislature: Targeted Assistance to Schools and Districts at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0409accountability.pdf> .
  - **School and District Assistance for the state's highest need districts**, state budget line-item 7061-9408, received \$10,375,818 after the FY09 9C cuts for district and/or school assistance in 140 districts. Center staff assists districts in planning local professional development consistent with grant priorities. (Note: This includes monies rolled forward to support summer initiatives.) Of the total, approximately 60% is designated for ongoing district or school-based professional development. In addition, 95 percent of non-state funding supported ongoing district or school based professional development that assists districts in planning and implementing programs.
  - Of the federal **No Child Left Behind Title I School Improvement** funding 95 percent supports ongoing district or school based professional development that assists districts in planning and implementing programs. Federal Title 1 school improvement funds are also used to provide teachers with additional time for collaboration on lesson development and professional support.

## Center for Special Programs

### Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office

The Center for Special Programs, Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office oversees professional development supported by federal special education funds. For further information, please see Attachment 1.

- In FY09, IDEA: Part B: Technical Assistance funds supported the following professional development activities.
  - **Program Improvement Grant (Fund Code 274)**. In FY09, \$4,000,000 was allocated to support program improvement grants to advance the skills of educators working with students with disabilities through high-quality, intensive, and sustained professional

development activities. All public school districts and educational collaboratives are eligible to apply for this grant.

- **Program Improvement Grant (Fund Code 249).** In FY09, \$250,000 was allocated to enhance program-based induction, mentoring, and retention programs to advance the skills of educators through professional development activities. All approved private special education schools are eligible to apply for this grant program.
- **Special education professional development institutes.** In FY09, \$855,000 was allocated for special education professional development institutes designed to provide sustained, high quality professional development for educators who work with students with disabilities in selected districts across the state. In FY09, 325 educators representing 90 districts participated in these institutes.
- **Comprehensive system of professional development training.** In FY09, \$3,000 was allocated to develop a comprehensive system of professional development training to support professional development activities of educators, parents, and agency work in 12 districts.
- **NASDE Satellite Series.** In FY09, \$4,800 was allocated to the NASDSE Satellite Series for distance learning opportunities in 38 districts.
- **2008-2009 FOCUS Academy.** In FY09, a federal personnel development grant provided \$372,090 for the 2008-2009 Massachusetts FOCUS Academy that is housed on MASSONE as an integrated statewide online professional development system. One hundred and eighty-four educators in 54 districts participated in the fall 2008 course; the spring 2009 course enrollment is currently underway.

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's offices that oversee grant-funded professional development maintain provider lists that document the qualifications of providers to deliver specified professional development. For professional development that is not grant-funded, the Department maintains a database of professional development providers that offer opportunities to obtain Professional Development Points (PDPs) for re-certification and advancement.

## **II. Recommendations for the FY10 State Professional Development Plan**

The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education made recommendations for professional development at maintenance levels and expansion levels for FY10 in various state budget line-items. The board recommended the consolidation of the three literacy line-items: John Silber, BayState Reading Initiative and early literacy tutorial at a maintenance level of \$4,767,223 and an expansion level of \$10,000,000. Mathematics and science PD recommendations were \$442,230 for maintenance, \$4,991,367 for expansion; English language acquisition and special education were consolidated into one line-item at \$470,987 for maintenance, \$1,000,000 for expansion; school leadership line-item was recommended at \$500,000 for maintenance, \$1,000,000 for expansion; and WPI School of Excellence and gifted and talented line-items were consolidated into one line-item at \$1,621,879 for maintenance and \$2,245,774 for expansion. The Board's FY10 budget recommendations can be viewed at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/boe/docs/1208/fy10budget.xls> .

As is clear from the preceding discussion and the description of grant-funded professional development in Attachment 1, the Department provides many high quality grant-funded opportunities for educators to improve content knowledge and pedagogical skills. As relevant as the Department's professional development opportunities are, however, they vary considerably across disciplines and are largely directed to the highest need communities in the state.

Limited resources also impact the extent to which the Department is able to provide direct assistance to districts in designing professional development plans. Currently, this assistance is limited to those districts that receive state or federal grants. The Department does not have the staffing or resources to establish professional development partnerships with all of the districts and schools that are not meeting Annual Yearly Progress goals, let alone all of the districts and schools in the state.

Finally, the Department has limited resources to maintain a database of approved professional development providers who offer opportunities for obtaining PDPs and to monitor the appropriateness of professional development for re-certification and advancement. As a result, districts may not be aware of professional development providers with an established track record of providing high quality professional development on specified topics. In addition, only those professional development providers who are familiar with Department practices are likely to know about the Department's provider lists and apply to be identified as a preferred provider. The result is a somewhat fragmented professional development system with a limited number of providers that receive the bulk of the funding for professional development services in the state.

Massachusetts will benefit from coherence in its professional development system in order to achieve a unity of purpose in state, district, and individual educator plans. The initial draft of the FY10 State Professional Development Plan provided in this report envisions a coherent statewide system of professional development as part of a comprehensive, statewide system of support. The following key ideas lie at the heart of the initial draft.

1. A coherent, centralized statewide system of professional development is a central component of a statewide system of support. It will offer all educators in Massachusetts's public school districts current information, tools, and resources to enhance research-informed and standards-based teaching. Leadership of this effort should be a responsibility of the Associate Commissioner of the Center for Curriculum and Instruction because it is this center that provides curriculum and instruction information and resources for all districts and schools across the Commonwealth. The goal is to ensure that the Department adds value to the work of districts and schools in their efforts to help all students achieve proficiency on the state's standards-based assessments and success in post-secondary education and careers. This system is envisioned as tiers of increasingly more intensive professional development based upon the needs of districts.
  - a. **Level 1 statewide professional development** is provided to all public school districts across the Commonwealth and is driven by the annual analysis of statewide MCAS data to identify ongoing challenges and establish priority goals for the following school year. In December 2008, the Department held its first annual Curriculum and Instruction Summit that identified current challenges in closing achievement gaps and established the

Department's strategies for addressing these performance gaps. See <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/summit/> for the summit agenda. Among the 2008 strategies for closing achievement gaps that were presented at the summit are development and dissemination of research-based instructional practices that are aligned with the integrated English Language Arts Framework and 21<sup>st</sup> century skills; Response-to-Intervention as a primary strategy for meeting the needs of individual learners at all grade levels; the use of formative assessments including curriculum-based, benchmark, and adaptive assessments to guide instructional decisions making; the analysis of student work to gauge progress toward proficiency; the integration of literacy skills and content instruction in middle and high schools; algebra in middle school; and reading and writing instruction for English language learners.

Elementary and Secondary Education Commissioner Mitchell Chester's presentation at the summit highlighted the current academic achievement of Massachusetts's students. It is the analysis of this data that drives decisions regarding the focus of the Department's strategies for closing achievement gaps in the current year. Commissioner Chester's presentation is posted on the Department's website at: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/summit/chester\\_summitaddress.pdf](http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/summit/chester_summitaddress.pdf)

It is recommended that all of Massachusetts's public districts are invited to attend the annual summit, as well as periodic professional development offerings throughout the year that address the identified topics and strategies intended to close achievement gaps. Ongoing professional development available to all public school districts may include webinars on critical topics, dissemination of web-based tools and resources aligned with the state's curriculum standards, and online courses, summer courses, content institutes, and conferences offered by the Department and its external partners consistent with the year's priorities. Under consideration is also the development of the Massachusetts Educator Academy in which the Department offers courses that are differentiated for novice, experienced, and mentor educators as part of ongoing and sustained professional development. All of these efforts will benefit from external partners that serve as advisors to the content offices on professional development activities and assist content offices with development and dissemination of web-based resources, presentations, and courses that are part of statewide professional development opportunities.

- b. **Level 2 regional professional development** is offered for high need, low performing districts in which one or more of a district's schools are identified for failing to meet AYP targets. These districts are eligible for grant-funded professional development opportunities as well as Level 1 opportunities described above. As part of Level 2 support, these districts may be eligible for grant-funded professional development as well as opportunities available to all public school districts across the state. Periodic regional conferences and meetings are open to all of these districts and are focused not only on statewide data and goals as established in the annual summit, but also analysis of district data and goals. It is recommended that the state's professional development providers (e.g., the Office of Literacy's implementation facilitators) serve as curriculum and instruction leaders within the established regions. Their responsibilities may include: 1) assisting districts in the development of local professional development plans including

professional learning community activities consistent with state and district priorities; 2) working closely with the state's assistance staff to ensure complementary and consistent dissemination of critical messages regarding research-informed and standards-based instructional practices; 3) collaborating with external partners in ongoing regional professional development; 4) collaborating with external partners who are providing local professional development to ensure consistency with Department goals and priorities; and 5) helping districts network to share experiences and learn from one another.

c. **Level 3 district-based professional development** is intended for the highest need, lowest performing districts in which the district and/or one or more of its schools are identified for failing to meet AYP targets.<sup>1</sup> These districts are eligible for grant-funded professional development opportunities as well as Level 1 and Level 2 opportunities described above. The Department's professional development providers provide more intensive professional development support in these districts. This may include training local staff who are then responsible for training others in their district, assisting the district in the development of local professional development plans, and working with external providers engaged in local professional learning activities consistent with state and district priorities and goals. Professional development providers also work closely with district content coordinators on the dissemination of research-informed and standards-based practices and the sustainability of successful practices across all schools.

2. Identification of a coordinator of professional development who reports to the Associate Commissioner of the Center for Curriculum and Instruction is critical to the coherence of a statewide system of professional development. Recommended responsibilities of the coordinator may include: 1) convening a department-wide committee of staff with professional development responsibilities to develop the FY10 statewide professional development plan; 2) overseeing the statewide system of professional development as approved by the State Board of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; 3) working with the Department's Center for Targeted Assistance to ensure that the goals of professional development and targeted support are complementary and consistent; 4) working with external partners to develop mutually beneficial relationships to enhance the state's capacity to serve all of its public school districts; 5) establishing procedures for maintaining a database of professional development partners and procedures for monitoring the quality of professional development offerings; 6) establishing procedures in collaboration with the Office of Educator Licensure regarding the monitoring of awarded PDPs for completion of high quality and appropriate professional development opportunities consistent with Department priorities; and 7) maintaining and disseminating current information about the Department's professional development initiatives to all stakeholders within the Department and in public school districts.
3. Given the current staffing and resources of the Department, there is a critical need to mobilize external partners in a statewide system of professional development. The identification of one or more organizing entities for regional professional development may be a useful strategy for bringing together external partners. However, the success of this model may hinge on the extent to which these entities work closely with the Department and

---

<sup>1</sup> These districts are referred to as Commissioner's Districts.

local districts to ensure consistency of strategies for achieving mutually agreed upon goals. Developing mutually beneficial relationships with institutions of higher education, consultants, collaboratives, and other organizations with professional development expertise requires identification of the most pressing problems that face the state and local districts and a collaborative approach between professional development providers, state staff, and local practitioners to solve these problems. For example, educational research that contributes to improvements in student achievement is one form of partnership that benefits both the interests of university faculty and the needs of public schools. Similarly, opportunities for pre-service students to work as tutors or interventionists in schools advance the interests of higher education and public schools.

In 1995, the Department published a registry of all professional development providers in the state. Currently, the Department maintains a database of registered professional development providers, but this database is not widely distributed. It is time to redesign a publicly disseminated registry that monitors the quality of providers for specific content and pedagogy. For grant-funded professional development as well as non-grant-funded professional development for re-certification and advancement, it would be helpful to have a database of providers that are approved by content offices. These providers should have expertise in those topics and strategies articulated as the focus of the Department's current efforts to close achievement gaps. Periodic review of providers to ensure that they continue to be qualified to provide professional development on specified topics should be part of this process. Casting a wide net for providers who are regionally located and are interested in working closely with the Department to deliver professional development topics consistent with the strategies identified as part of the annual summit will require the coordination of offices across the Department. This information can and should be shared across the units of the Department as well as with districts.

4. Similarly, it is important for the Department to monitor the appropriateness of professional development for PDPs leading to re-certification and advancement. Working closely with school principals for the review and monitoring of the quality of Educator Professional Development Plans will help to ensure that PDPs are awarded for professional development consistent with the Department and district's current goals and priorities to close achievement gaps and prepare students for success in postsecondary education and careers.

The following initial draft of the FY10 State Plan for Professional Development is intended to serve as a catalyst for discussion and collaboration across all centers and offices of the Department that are engaged in professional development activities.

### **III. An Initial Draft of the Proposed FY10 State Plan for Professional Development**

As required by the [Education Reform Law of 1993](#), the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education herein presents its 2009-2010 Massachusetts Plan for Professional Development. This Plan supports the implementation of the state [curriculum frameworks](#) through curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices, and promotes professional development as an integral part of Department activities. The Plan is based on the premise that strong classroom teachers, visionary instructional leaders, and high quality

professional development are essential to the reform of public education and to the improvement of student learning.

**This plan addresses the following topics:**

- Priorities for Educator Professional Development
- Features of Effective Professional Development
- Responsibilities of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
- Responsibilities of School Districts
- Responsibilities of Professional Development Providers

This plan calls for the development of a coherent, unified, and comprehensive professional development system with aligned statewide, district, and individual educator professional development goals. The purpose of this plan is to improve educator knowledge of research-informed and standards-based content and instructional practices that will contribute to student proficiency and success in postsecondary education and careers.

**Priorities for Educator Professional Development**

The Department has identified four priorities for statewide, district, and individual educator professional development. The plan calls for the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, districts, and external partners including institutions of higher education, consultants, collaboratives, and other organizations with professional development expertise to focus the content and pedagogy of professional development on the following priorities:

- Base professional development primarily of needs identified by the annual analysis of state and district achievement data.
- Select strategies for professional development consistent with the topics presented at the Department’s Annual Summit on Curriculum and Instruction to close current achievement gaps, especially for English language learners, students with special needs, students of major ethnic and racial minorities, and students living in poverty.
- Extend educators’ familiarity with, and use of, the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and aligned instructional resources, research support, and exemplars of proficient student work.
- Use a model of tiered curriculum delivery to deliver differentiated, high-quality instruction that meets the needs of individual students. This requires the use of ongoing formative data as the basis for instructional decision making and the use of core and intervention strategies that are most effective for individual learners.

**Features of Effective Professional Development**

There is general agreement that effective professional development includes not just the acquisition of research-informed content knowledge from informed experts, but more importantly, multiple opportunities to engage actively in applying content knowledge to everyday practice. Participation in professional learning communities, cross-district meetings, and opportunities to practice implementing recommended instructional practices with feedback from peer or expert coaches are essential elements of a comprehensive, unified, and coherent

professional development program. Through such opportunities, educators become confident in their ability to incorporate best practices into daily instruction.

The National Governors' Association Report, *Transforming Professional Development for Teachers: A Guide for State Policymakers* (1995), identifies certain "critical tests" by which to measure all professional development activities. In particular:

- Are they intellectually challenging?
- Do they add to the participants' repertoire of skills and content knowledge?
- Do they enhance educators' contributions to the school community?
- Do they lead to improvement in teaching practice?

To this, it is important to add:

- Do they contribute to improvements in student proficiency and readiness for postsecondary education and careers?

### **Responsibilities of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**

A coherent statewide system of professional development offers all educators in Massachusetts's public school districts current information, tools, and resources to enhance research-informed and standards-based teaching and ensure that all students graduate from Massachusetts's public schools ready for success in postsecondary education and careers. This system is envisioned as tiers of increasingly more intensive professional development based upon the needs of districts to close achievement gaps and expand expectations for learning.

The statewide system of professional development is constructed as a critical part of the statewide system of support. The Associate Commissioner for Curriculum and Instruction has oversight for the statewide system of professional development, and a designated coordinator of professional development reports to the Associate Commissioner for Curriculum and Instruction. This individual works with all state and district staff, as well as external partners, who are responsible for professional development to ensure a coherent, consistent, and comprehensive approach to professional development across the Commonwealth.

Level 1 statewide professional development is provided to all public school districts across the Commonwealth and is driven by the annual analysis of statewide MCAS data to identify ongoing challenges and establish priority goals for the following school year. All public school districts are encouraged to participate in the following Department opportunities:

- An annual Curriculum and Instruction Summit that identifies current challenges in closing achievement gaps and establishes the Department's strategies for addressing these performance gaps.
- Ongoing professional development available to all public school districts including: 1) webinars on critical topics; 2) use of the Department's web-based tools and resources aligned with the state's curriculum standards including exemplars of student work, research reports, lesson plans, video clips of high quality instructional practices, and formative assessments aligned with the standards-based MCAS assessment; and 3) online courses, summer courses, content institutes, leadership training, and conferences offered

by the Department and its external partners consistent with the year's priorities for novice, experienced, and mentor teachers as part of the Massachusetts Educator Academy.

Effective statewide professional development requires an extensive network of external providers who may be called upon to assist the state in its statewide efforts as well as to serve as content developers, presenters, and advisers. Partners submit proposals to the content offices to serve as Department professional development providers for specified purposes. Content offices approve proposals and share this information with the coordinator of professional development who maintains a provider database that is available as a resource for all state and district staff.

Level 2 regional professional development is offered for high need, low performing districts in which one or more of a district's schools have not met AYP targets and is offered in a regional system of professional development. These districts may be eligible for grant-funded professional development opportunities as well as Level 1 opportunities described above. In addition to the above, these districts are encouraged to participate in periodic regional conferences and meetings, the content of which is intended to address current challenges as identified in state and district data.

To assist districts in developing professional development opportunities, the professional development staff of the Department's content offices serves as curriculum and instruction leaders within the established regions. Responsibilities may include:

- Assisting in the development of district professional development plans including local professional learning community activities consistent with state and district priorities;
- Developing and disseminating critical messages regarding research-informed and standards-based instructional practices;
- Collaborating with external partners identified by the Department in ongoing regional professional development;
- Collaborating with external partners identified by districts for district-based professional development consistent with Department goals and priorities; and
- Arranging networking opportunities to enable district and school staff to share experiences, showcase exemplary practice, and learn from one another.

Level 3 district-based professional development is offered for the highest need, lowest performing districts in which the district and/or one or more of its schools are identified for failing to meet AYP targets.<sup>2</sup> These districts are eligible for grant-funded professional development opportunities as well as Level 1 and Level 2 opportunities described above. Department professional development providers, along with targeted assistance staff, are assigned to each district to provide assistance with district-based professional development. In addition to Level 1 statewide professional development support, the Department's professional development providers also provide more intensive and direct support to develop and disseminate standards-based curriculum and research-informed instructional practices and to sustain successful practices.

---

<sup>2</sup> These districts are Commissioner's Districts.

To encourage high quality professional development in each of the tiers described above, the Department will:

- Maintain a current database of approved external professional development providers that is updated annually with course offerings and related information. This database will be available to all state and district staff;
- Prepare an annual calendar of all Department-sponsored professional development opportunities;
- Provide assistance to districts in developing local professional development plans including published guidance on the use of data to identify areas of challenge as the focus for professional development activities and on the state's current strategies for closing achievement gaps;
- Design rubrics to assist districts and participants in evaluating professional development programs and providers;
- Maintain guidelines for providers of professional development;
- Develop an online mechanism for maintaining educators' PDP information;
- Further clarify, based on educator inquiries, aspects of the [Recertification Guidelines for Massachusetts Educators](#), and evaluate the effectiveness of current methods for points assignment and for educator assessments; and
- Distribute this Plan to school districts after approval by the State Board of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

### **Responsibilities of School Districts**

School districts are required annually to adopt and implement a professional development plan for all principals, teachers, other professional staff employed by the district, and school council members. The Department encourages districts to make use of [local professional development committees](#) to strengthen the participation of all constituencies and to enhance professional development planning. Further, districts should be sure to recognize within their plans the overlapping and different needs of novice, experienced, and mentor educators.

The Department's regional professional development providers are available to assist districts that have not met AYP targets with the development of local professional development plans consistent with the Department's current goals and priorities. Districts that have not met AYP targets are required to share their plans with the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education ([Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 71, Section 38Q](#)).

Districts will be encouraged to connect professional development with continuous district and school-improvement planning. This connection is strengthened by recertification, which requires educators to have professional development plans that are consistent with school and/or district improvement plans.

Districts are responsible for utilizing MCAS data to identify areas of greatest need in professional development and for selecting providers of professional development that are of high quality and that address the identified learning needs in the district. Districts are encouraged to partner with institutions of higher education, consultants, collaboratives, and organizations with professional development expertise, as well as with non-traditional providers (e.g.,

laboratories or corporations, via work externships) to provide professional development opportunities. Districts are responsible for identifying the data to be collected on professional growth and on the quality and impact of district-sponsored professional development activities.

The [recertification regulations](#) outline minimum requirements for professional development. However, the Department encourages educators to participate in professional experiences that support and expand their content and professional skills *beyond* the minimum requirements. Accordingly, districts may choose to offer additional incentives, through collective bargaining, for educators to go beyond the minimum requirements for recertification and to continue to participate in professionally-relevant and academically-meaningful professional development.

Districts are required to set forth a budget for professional development within the confines of the FY10 foundation budget. These funds may be used for tuition, conference fees, contracted services, stipends, salaries, and materials.

## **Elements of an Effective District Plan**

### **Plan Development**

- Focuses on clearly defined goals and priorities for district-sponsored professional development consistent with the state's goals and priorities and based on an analysis of district MCAS data;
- Aligns professional development resources with district academic goals;
- Allows for the evaluation of professional development activities;
- Ensures that professional development activities are coordinated across the district;
- Identifies external partners with expertise in specified topics that are the focus of current improvement efforts, utilizing the Department's professional development provider database as a resource; and
- For districts that have not met AYP, utilizes the services of the Department's professional development providers to develop district professional development plans consistent with the state's goals and priorities.

### **Plan Structure**

- Fosters a professional learning community that encourages teachers to work together, not in isolation;
- Encourages networking of district and school staff with peers in neighboring districts and schools;
- Encourages educators to solicit feedback from each other to improve their practice;
- Identifies the primary models for delivering professional development in order to accomplish each of the indicated plan priorities;
- Emphasizes content-based offerings;
- Requires individual school-improvement plans to outline how professional development is to be linked to improving student achievement;
- Provides ongoing assistance to educators; and

- Includes methods and procedures for evaluating quality of professional development opportunities.

### **Financial Aspects of Plan**

- Includes analysis of current spending;
- Focuses spending on priority areas, such as literacy and mathematics;
- Uses external funding sources to support the overall district plan, rather than implementing separate systems for utilizing each source of funding; and
- Ensures that spending is aligned with district goals.

### **Elements of Effective District-Based Professional Development**

- Aligns with district, school, and state improvement goals;
- Encourages teams of teachers working together in professional learning communities;
- Focuses on content knowledge and application of content knowledge to practice;
- Provides on-the-job, ongoing support throughout the school year;
- Includes follow-up activities in the educator's own classroom;
- Connects professional development to the workplace and encourages teachers to develop curriculum and lesson plans that show students real world applications of their learning;
- Utilizes videotapes of the educators' own teaching for guided discussion, analysis, and review with the educator;
- Utilizes in-class observation of educator by mentors or peers;
- Includes pre- and post-assessments; and
- Requires products from participants, such as lesson plans or curriculum units.

### **School Councils**

The [Education Reform Law](#) requires school councils to annually draft School Improvement Plans, which focus on meeting the identified learning needs of all students. These plans should include professional development to support staff in meeting these needs.

### **Local Professional Development Committees**

Many districts form professional development committees that include administrators, teachers, parents, and community members. The Department encourages the formation of such committees. The collaboration of the different constituencies represented in such a committee is essential to the success of a comprehensive and effective professional development program. Such committees are most effective when they are empowered to make meaningful decisions.

These district-wide committees may be responsible for designing the district's annual professional development plan. The committee ensures that there are strong connections between district and school improvement plans and that professional development provides educators with opportunities to build on their subject-matter knowledge and learn additional effective practices that improve student learning and achievement. This group is often responsible for

advising the school community on the professional development process, on local guidelines and policies, and on no-cost options to fulfill recertification requirements.

### **Responsibilities of External Professional Development Partners**

Given the current staffing and resources of the Department, it is clear that there is a critical need to mobilize external partners in a statewide system of professional development as described above. The Department will cast a wide net to seek out qualified external professional development providers from institutions of higher education, consultant organizations, collaboratives, and other organizations with professional development expertise.

The primary mission of professional development providers is to assist educators in enhancing subject-matter knowledge and ways to develop student understanding of that subject through varied standards-oriented instructional and assessment practices. Professional development providers also assist districts in integrating professional development into system-wide and school improvement planning.

The goal is to establish mutually beneficial partnerships that serve the pressing needs of the state and its districts while affording partners sound opportunities to advance their professional skills. For example, educational research that is focused on solving critical problems identified by practitioners not only has the potential to help students improve their skills, but also to advance the knowledge base regarding best practices. In addition, involving college and university students in the work of schools as interventionists and tutors not only affords schools the opportunity to expand their pool of support staff, but provides students with hands-on experiences that will enhance their capacity to become confident and qualified educators, ready to take on the responsibilities of teachers more quickly than would otherwise be the case. Further, districts have many needs for partners who act as catalysts for professional learning communities, who assist with resource development, and who provide the link between research and implemented best practices.

For grant-funded professional development opportunities, qualified providers may be solicited by the Department or districts to provide specified professional development. In addition, there may be opportunities for districts to identify a provider from the state's provider database and to submit a proposal in conjunction with that provider for funding to provide specified courses, training, etc. External professional development providers for the Department's grant-funded opportunities are required to:

- Submit an application to the professional development provider database for the particular content area in which the provider would like to provide professional development. Providers must specify their qualifications regarding specific topics and strategies, especially those identified by the Department in its Annual Summit for Curriculum and Instruction as important to close achievement gaps. Once approved by the content office, the provider's information will be added to the Department's professional development provider database. This information will be widely disseminated throughout the Department and to the state's public school districts. Providers are required to update this information periodically, including providing

evaluation data that demonstrates that participants found the professional development to be appropriate for the intended purpose.

For professional development that is not grant funded, it is the responsibility of the district to select providers that are qualified to provide professional development on specified topics for PDPs. Districts are encouraged to review the state's professional development provider database to identify appropriate providers for specified purposes, but may offer PDPs as long as the professional development satisfies the requirements for PDPs as outlined in this document.

All external professional development providers are expected to:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of professional development offerings and to assess their impact, if any, on classroom practice;
- Address the content of the relevant state Curriculum Frameworks;
- Conduct professional development with clear objectives, relevant learning activities, and conclusions;
- Conduct professional development that recognizes the overlapping and different needs of beginning and veteran educators;
- Incorporate technology tools and appropriate media, as warranted;
- Build on educators' prior knowledge and experience;
- Use principles of adult learning theory to engage educators in professional growth;
- Employ a variety of teaching techniques such as direct instruction, small group discussion, practice with peer feedback, problem-solving, Socratic dialogue, and research projects;
- Provide many and varied opportunities for educators to incorporate new knowledge and skills into classroom practice or school and district management; and
- Evaluate teacher learning through an appropriate assessment. For example, this may be a written exam, a lesson plan or a curriculum unit.

Examples of professional development services that external partners can provide include:

#### Level 1: Statewide Professional Development

- Advise the Department's content offices on professional development content;
- Develop research-informed and standards-based resources to be linked to the state's curriculum standards including web-based lesson plans, video clips, exemplars of student work, research reports, formative assessments and rubrics, and reviews of core and intervention programs for efficacy;
- Develop and present courses for novice, experienced, and mentor educators as part of the Massachusetts Educator Academy including webinars, online courses, content institutes, and conference presentations for leaders and teachers; and/or
- Review of materials and programs for evidence of effectiveness.

#### Level 2: Regional Professional Development

- Collaborate with the Department's professional development providers on regional professional development presentations; and/or

- Assist districts with identified professional development needs, especially related to challenges identified through data analysis and to the state’s current strategies to address achievement gaps. This may include, for example, collaborative research of higher education faculty and practitioners that is intended to solve local educational problems and improve student achievement; presentations and workshops; standards-based alignment of curriculum and instruction; development of instructional resources; engaging students as tutors or interventionists; and evaluation of the effectiveness of programs or materials.

Level 3: District-Based Professional Development

- Collaborate with the Department’s professional development providers on district or school-based professional development, especially related to challenges identified through data analysis, and the state’s current strategies to address achievement gaps. See Level 2 for examples of appropriate external professional development activities.

**IV. Budgetary Request to Consolidate the State Budget Lines for Literacy**

The mission of the Office of Literacy at the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is to add value to the efforts of Massachusetts’s public school districts in helping all students become proficient in their reading and their use of oral and written language. By providing literacy leadership and guidance on standards-based curriculum and research-informed literacy practices, the Office of Literacy contributes to the efforts of local districts to ensure that students graduate from high school ready for the rigor of postsecondary education and 21<sup>st</sup> century careers.

As part of the 2008 reorganization of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Office of Literacy is now part of the Center for Curriculum and Instruction. Prior to the current school year, the Office of Literacy’s primary responsibility has been to work closely with the state’s highest need communities to improve literacy achievement. Previous funding has helped the Office develop its internal capacity to support these districts and their schools. (See Attachment 1 for a description of the literacy initiatives that the Office of Literacy currently manages.) Thus far, the Office of Literacy has engaged external partners including consultants and university and college educators on an as-needed basis for professional development opportunities through its preferred provider process. The time has come, we believe, to greatly expand our partnerships to support all of the state’s public school districts in their efforts to improve the literacy achievement of all students.

For FY10, the Office of Literacy proposes that its work focus on the following goals:

1. Mobilization of external partners to advise and support the Office of Literacy’s statewide, regional, and district-based professional development and targeted assistance for local efforts consistent with statewide initiatives. The proposed statewide system of professional development described in this document is based, in part, on the Office of Literacy’s current model of professional development. This model supports tiers of professional development of increasing intensity depending upon the need of districts.

2. Development and dissemination of a tiered model of literacy curriculum delivery that is the foundation for general education in all districts as they employ strategies for closing literacy achievement gaps. Achieving proficiency on the Massachusetts English Language Arts standards requires: 1) standards-based curriculum alignment; 2) the use of research-informed instructional practices consistent with the standards; 3) the use of formative assessment data to guide instructional decision making; 4) the use of effective core and intervention instructional materials to meet the needs of all learners at all grade levels; and 5) ongoing and sustained professional development and technical assistance to help educators build their knowledge base and capacity to deliver high quality instruction

For FY10, the Office of Literacy proposes to sharpen the focus of its work to address the most pressing achievement gaps, especially in the areas of vocabulary development and comprehension of literary and expository text. In order to do this, the Office of Literacy plans to mobilize external partners that will assist the Office of Literacy as advisors and professional development providers for statewide activities and direct service professional development providers to public school districts that have not met the state's AYP targets.

To accomplish these goals, the Office of Literacy recommends that all literacy lines in the state budget are unified with oversight by the Office of Literacy. This includes the John Silber Early Literacy Program (7030-1003), the Early Literacy Tutorial Intervention Program (7030-1005), and the Bay State Reading Institute (7010-0020). This consolidation will enable the Department to expand its collaborations with external professional development providers and therefore expand its reach to many more of Massachusetts's public school districts. Current providers, as well as new partners including faculty from institutions of higher education, consultants, collaboratives, and other organizations with professional development expertise, will be asked to assist the Office of Literacy or public school districts in their professional development efforts.

Currently, all funds in the John Silber Early Literacy Program and the Early Literacy Tutorial Intervention state budget lines provide district grants for one or more schools. Districts have discretion to determine how to use the John Silber Early Literacy Program funds for K-3 literacy instruction, given a menu of options that includes curriculum and assessment resources, the salary for a literacy coach, professional development, and technical assistance. The Early Literacy Tutorial Intervention grants support the training of Reading Recovery teachers and the partial salary of Reading Recovery teachers. Reading Recovery teachers work exclusively with grade 1 students who are at risk for reading failure. The Bay State Reading Institute offers professional development and coaching for principals and reading coaches, primarily at grades K-3. Currently, there is no state funding for middle or high schools. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education suggests that the lines are consolidated and the language modified to allow the funds to be used for adolescent literacy in grades 4 and above in addition to continuing the current focus on K-3 early literacy:

\_\_\_\_For literacy programs, including but not limited to the Bay State Reading Institute, Inc., early literacy grants to cities, towns and regional school districts, and early intervention tutorial literacy programs designed as a pre-special education referral and short-term intervention for children who are at risk of failing to read in the first grade

One approach to engagement of external partners would be to offer professional development grants to districts that have one or more schools that have not met AYP targets. Districts would apply for these funds to provide professional development or targeted coaching support consistent with the Department's current strategies and priorities to close achievement gaps. They would designate a professional development partner to help them in their efforts. The current external partners that receive state-funded literacy grants (i.e., Bay State Reading Institute, Reading Recovery) may be identified by districts as professional development partners, but additional partners with expertise in specific topics may also be identified for this work. The Department's professional development providers for literacy would collaborate with the external partners to ensure consistency of message with the Department's goals and priorities.

Consistent with the initial draft of the revised FY10 State Professional Development Plan as described in this document, the Office of Literacy envisions a statewide system of professional development composed of three tiers of increasingly intensive support depending upon the needs of districts and/or individual schools that have not met AYP targets.

## V. Attachment 1. Examples of Professional Development Provided by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in FY09

### Literacy

The Center for Curriculum and Instruction, Office of Literacy oversees the state-funded John Silber Early Literacy Initiative (Silber) and the Targeted Tutorial Literacy Program. It also manages the federal No Child Left Behind Reading First project and the Massachusetts Middle and High School Reading Initiative funded by special education. The Bay State Reading Institute is a state-funded literacy initiative that is independent of the Office of Literacy's oversight. The literacy professional development is designed to be scaled-up and could be offered to a larger group of districts as part of a statewide system of support.

- The **John Silber Early Literacy Initiative** (Silber), state budget line-item 7030-1003, was allocated \$3,236,158 in FY09 after the 9C cuts. Of this, \$2,868,658 supports K-3 reading instruction in 31 high-need schools in 13 districts. The balance is allocated to earmarks. Most of the Silber schools are 2007 Commonwealth Priority schools that are identified for corrective action or restructuring in the aggregate for English language arts at grade 3 or those identified for restructuring based on subgroups at grade 3. These schools serve approximately 6,000 K-3 students. These schools receive grants to implement the scientifically based reading instruction consistent with the federal Reading First project and have literacy coaches who work with K-3 classroom teachers to implement recommended practices. Silber schools participate in the Office of Literacy's early literacy professional development model. This includes statewide and regional professional development opportunities for district and school leaders and literacy coaches and limited district and/or school support provided by the state's assigned implementation facilitator. In FY09, professional development topics include foundational training for new teachers, the integration of science content and literacy skills in K-3 classrooms, the development of literary and informational text vocabulary, and the ongoing implementation of Response-to-Intervention (RtI), or tiered models of curriculum delivery, to meet the needs of individual learners. The topics reflect the Office of Literacy's current focus areas of research-informed and standards-based instructional practices, particularly in the areas of reading comprehension and vocabulary development and its predominant strategy of Response-to-Intervention (RtI) to close literacy achievement and expectation gaps.
- The **Targeted Tutorial Literacy Program**, state budget line-item 7030-1005, was allocated \$2,235,705 in FY09 after the 9C cuts. The project supports the training of 359 Reading Recovery teachers and the partial salary support of 66 of these teachers. The funding supports tutorial reading instruction for 2,872 grade 1 students who are having difficulty learning to read. Reading Recovery is an early intervention individual tutorial literacy program that is designed as a general education short-term intervention for students who are at risk of failing to learn to read in grade 1 and is a pre-special education referral program.
- The federal **Reading First** project is part of the No Child Left Behind Act and is now in its sixth year of funding. The Department expects that 2008-2009 will be the final year of Reading First funding. In 2008-2009, 48 high-need schools in 23 high-need districts are the recipients of Reading First grants to implement evidence-based reading instruction for

approximately 13,000 K-3 students. Most of these schools are identified as 2007 Commonwealth Priority Schools. Of the FY09 grant of \$5.5 million, a minimum of 80% is allocated to funded districts. Of the state's reserved 20%, a maximum of \$715,000 is available for statewide and regional professional development provided by the Department. Reading First districts use the majority of their funding for local professional development and to support the salaries of literacy coaches; literacy coaches are responsible for providing embedded professional development. The district's professional development plans for Reading First activities are approved by the Office of Literacy to ensure consistency with grant priorities. Districts and schools that receive Reading First funds participate in the Office of Literacy's early literacy professional development model as described above for the Silber grant. One major difference, however, is that the Reading First grant supports the salaries of the state's regional system of professional development providers (i.e., implementation facilitators). As such, these staff members are also available to provide direct district-based and school-based professional development to Reading First schools. Reading First also supports school-based K-3 literacy coaches who work with classroom teachers to implement recommended practices.

- The **Massachusetts Middle and High School Reading Initiative** is funded by special education. In FY09, this initiative received \$639,040 to assist 916 middle and high school educators in 60 schools in their implementation of the Massachusetts Secondary Literacy Framework and to engage leadership teams in a statewide professional development network. Since its inception in FY03, this project has funded 117 middle and high schools in four cohorts of participants. Recipient schools receive small planning grants to form reading leadership teams and to develop a school profile of current practices and a related school action plan. For three succeeding years, schools receive small grants to implement one or more elements of their action plans. In FY09, the topics of statewide professional development meetings were reading and writing across the content areas, building 21st century literacy skills, integrating reading and writing with technology, and motivating and engaging adolescent readers and writers. Leadership teams that attend these meetings are responsible for sharing what they have learned with staff at their own schools and disseminating the information to other middle and high schools in their district.
- The **Bay State Reading Institute**, state budget line-item 7010-0020, provides reading and principal coaching and professional development in 18 K-6 schools. After the FY09 9C cuts, the Bay State Reading Institute received \$1,192,800. The majority of this funding supports school-based coaching with the balance for professional development. This initiative is independent of the Center on Curriculum and Instruction, Office of Literacy's work. Approximately 90% of the coaches' time is spent coaching, and the remainder is spent organizing the training programs. FY09 professional development topics include phonological awareness and phonics, Response-to-Intervention, and differentiated instruction.

## **Mathematics and Science**

The Office for Mathematics, Science, and Technology/Engineering oversees the Mathematics and Science Teacher Content-Based Professional Development, state budget line-item 7061-

9804. After the FY09 9C cuts, \$486,227 was allocated to support the following: 1) the Massachusetts Intel Mathematics Initiative that engaged 150 K-8 mathematics teachers in an 80-hour foundational content course and school-based mathematics learning communities; 2) the 2008 Teacher Professional Development Institutes (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/cinstitute/08/>) that provided content training in mathematics and science for over 400 educators across the state; 3) the ALEKS Mathematics MTEL Preparation Pilot Study; 4) a science initiative; and 5) a \$100,000 earmark to provide matching funds for an initiative promoting advanced placement mathematics courses. The Office for Mathematics and Science also manages the federal Title IIB Mathematics and Science Partnership Program that is part of the No Child Left Behind Act. The mathematics and science professional development is designed to be scaled-up and could be offered regionally as part of a statewide system of support.

- The **Professional Development Institute Program**, is a statewide program that has been offered by the Department for 14 years. The Professional Development Institutes are offered in partnership with a high-need district and a high quality provider (in some cases from higher education and in others a private or professional organization or cultural institution) with strong content and pedagogical expertise in their field. Each summer the department funds approximately 24-31 (based on available funding) graduate level courses, cost-free to educators. Each year approximately 500-600 math and science, ELL, SPED and Title I teachers, coaches, paraprofessionals, and administrators participate in these courses. Each course is 45 hours of direct instruction and an additional 10-15 hours that support implementation of the course content into the participants' classrooms. All teachers are pre/post tested for content knowledge gain and required to develop a product that shows evidence of their learning. PDPs and graduate credits are available. Every year since 1994, over 96% of the institutes show significant content gains for participants. Over 94% of the participants indicated that they would attend another institute by their provider. Surveys are administered to each participant for the following information: demographic, licensure, teaching background, purpose for attending the course, teaching assignment, evaluation of the provider and course, etc.
- **Massachusetts Intel Mathematics Initiative (MIMI)**. In the fall of 2006, the Department entered into a partnership with the Intel Corporation, the UMass Medical School's Regional Science Resource Center, and University of Vermont mathematician Dr. Kenneth Gross. Through this partnership the Massachusetts Intel Mathematics Initiative (MIMI) was launched in the summer of 2007, offering 150 elementary and middle school math teachers an 80-hour course focused on K-8 foundational content (e.g., arithmetical operations, proportional reasoning, linear equations). This first cohort of participants drew from high-need districts including Boston, Springfield and New Bedford. Participants finished the course in the fall of 2007 and met regularly throughout the school year in mathematical learning communities to extend their learning and improve instructional practice. An additional 175 teachers completed the intensive 80-hour mathematics course in the fall of 2008. Worcester has been added to the original districts so that the three largest urban districts in the Commonwealth are participating in the initiative. MIMI Initiative information is posted online: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/omste/news07/mimi.html>
- The **Title IIB Mathematics and Science Partnership Program** is part of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. This competitive program awards 3-year grants to partnerships of

higher education STEM departments with high-need school districts. These partnerships offer a course or a series of content-based courses to teachers in the partner districts. Each course is a graduate level course, at least 45 hours, teachers are pre/post tested for content knowledge gain, and in some partnerships the series of courses lead to the attainment of a Master's Degree. During FY08, approximately 45 courses were offered and educators from more than 40 mainly high-need districts participated. Last year, the program served approximately 500 K-12 math and science teachers. From 1994-2007, 19 partnerships have been funded around math and/or science content. In all, over 131 courses have been delivered and more than 1,300 teachers representing mainly high-need districts have participated. (Note: 131 courses represent 2,589 seats, many teachers take more than one Title IIB courses in a given year). The courses included: 106 mathematics courses, 21 science, 3 technology/engineering courses, and 1 integrated mathematics and science course.

### **English Language Acquisition**

The Center on Curriculum and Instruction also includes the Office of English Language Acquisition.

- The Office of English Language Acquisition oversees the **English Language Acquisition Professional Development** state budget line-item 7027-1004. After the 9C cuts in FY09, \$468,161 was appropriated to support professional development for educators of English language learners implementing sheltered English immersion and teaching English language acquisition. This funding supported the professional development of approximately 3,500 teachers. The funding also supported the MELT initiative, preparing an additional 40 licensed teachers to become qualified ESL teachers. Finally, this funding has also enabled the continued development and implementation of a professional development initiative on content-based ESL curriculum development and instruction for approximately 50 classroom (both ESL and content) teachers representing 18 districts, during 2008-2009. For further information, see the 2009 Report to the Legislature: English Language Acquisition Professional Development.
- The Office of English Language Acquisition manages a federally funded project that used \$59,486 in No Child Left Behind Act: **Title III funds** in FY09 to support districts in their development of an ESL curriculum. In 2008, 65 teachers from 12 different district teams participated in this ESL curriculum development project.

### **Gifted and Talented**

The Center on Curriculum and Instruction, Office of Humanities oversees the **Gifted and Talented Education** state budget line-item 7061-9621. After the FY09 9C cuts, \$507,749 was allocated to support four Gifted and Talented Resource Centers comprised of a consortium of a district with established Gifted and Talented services, a college or university, and optionally, cultural institutions. These centers are: Framingham/Framingham State; East Longmeadow/UMASS Amherst; Barnstable/UMASS Amherst, UMASS Dartmouth, and local cultural centers; and Triton Regional/College of William and Mary, Mass Audubon and Historic New England. The centers work regionally with districts to provide graduate coursework, professional development, and consulting and school site visits in differentiated instruction,

acceleration, and the theoretical and historical bases for working with academically advanced students.

### **Educator Leadership**

The Center for Leadership and School Redesign, Office of Educator Leadership oversees the **National Institute for School Leadership** (NISL) instructional leadership training for principals and superintendents, state budget line-item 7061-911. After the FY09 9C cuts, \$980,000 was allocated for leadership academics for the training of 445 principals and superintendents in 13 districts. These academies address the following topics: the educational challenge; the principal as strategic thinker; standards-based instructional systems and school design; foundations of coaching; the principal as instructional leader and team builder; the principal as ethical leader; the principal as driver of change; and leading for results. NISL has established a model of leadership academies that can be scaled-up and fully integrated into a statewide system of professional development and assistance to districts and schools. For further information on this and other leadership initiatives, please see the 2009 Report to the Legislature: Professional Development for Leadership.

### **School and District Assistance**

The Center for School and District Assistance oversees the state-funded School and District Assistance projects as well as the federal No Child Left Behind Title I School Improvement funding. For further information, please see the 2009 Report to the Legislature: Targeted Assistance to Schools and Districts.

- **School and District Assistance** funding for the state's highest need districts, state budget line-item 7061-9408, was allocated \$10,375,818 after the FY09 9C cuts (Note: This includes monies rolled forward to support summer initiatives.) for projects in 140 districts. Center staff assists districts in planning local professional development consistent with grant priorities. Of the total approximately 60% is designated for ongoing district or school-based professional development. For example, the Department engaged America's Choice to support and expand the turnaround plan for the Holyoke Public Schools. America's Choice officials worked closely with Department's staff and Holyoke leaders to design a comprehensive implementation plan and to guide and support the district's improvement. This includes school-level and/or district-level leadership coaching and support provided by partner organizations or consultants in addition to the NSIL training. Teachers participate in a range of professional development opportunities that include mathematics content, ESL content and licensure, upper elementary and middle school literacy development, standards-based instruction, and mathematics content coaching.
- In addition, 95% of the federal No Child Left Behind **Title I School Improvement** funding supports ongoing district or school based professional development that assists districts in planning and implementing programs. Federal Title 1 school improvement funds are also used to provide teachers with additional time for collaboration on lesson development and professional support.

## Center for Special Programs

The Center for Special Programs, Special Education Planning and Policy Development Office oversees professional development supported by federal special education funds. In FY09, IDEA: Part B: Technical Assistance funds supported the following professional development activities.

- **Program Improvement Grant** (Fund Code 274). In FY09, \$4,000,000 was allocated to support program improvement grants to advance the skills of educators working with students with disabilities through high-quality, intensive, and sustained professional development activities. All public school districts and educational collaboratives are eligible to apply for this grant. This grant has four priorities: 1) induction, mentoring, and retention; 2) inclusive practices with students with autism spectrum disorders; 3) curriculum development, assessment, and instruction; and 4) positive behavioral and social skills strategies for the classroom.
- **Program Improvement Grant** (Fund Code 249). In FY09, \$250,000 was allocated to enhance program-based induction, mentoring, and retention programs to advance the skills of educators through professional development activities. All approved private special education schools are eligible to apply for this grant program. This grant has two priorities: 1) induction, mentoring, and recruitment; and 2) curriculum development, instruction, and classroom assessment.
- **Special education professional development institutes**. In FY09, \$855,000 was allocated for special education professional development institutes designed to provide sustained, high quality professional development for educators who work with students with disabilities in selected districts across the state. In FY09, 325 educators representing 90 districts participated in these institutes. This grant has the following priorities: 1) assessing English language learners with disabilities; 2) developing the socialization skills of students with Autism Spectrum Disorder in inclusive classrooms; 3) IEP team facilitation skills; 4) effective evaluation of special education programs; 5) managing behavior in the inclusive classroom; 6) mathematics and science and technology: American Sign Language; 7) occupational therapy services in educational settings; 8) special education leadership academies for new and experienced administrators; 9) strategies for students with sensory integration dysfunction; 10) sustaining Braille proficiency of licensed teachers of students with visual impairments; and 11) topics in teaching literacy to students who are deaf or hard-of-hearing.
- **Comprehensive system of professional development training**. In FY09, \$3,000 was allocated to develop a comprehensive system of professional development training to support professional development activities of educators, parents, and agency works in 12 districts. This project has the following priorities: 1) Massachusetts IEP process; 2) a principal's role and special education in Massachusetts; 3) is special education the right service; 4) specific learning disabilities: eligibility determinations; 5) transition from adolescent to adulthood in Massachusetts; and 6) transition planning.
- **NASDE Satellite Series**. In FY09, \$4,800 was allocated to the NASDSE Satellite Series for distance learning opportunities in 38 districts. This project includes: 1) resources for students with autism and their families; 2) partners in progress: youth and young adult leaders; 3) from computers to classrooms: tackling bullies in today's schools; and 4) understanding federal policy and its impact on the classroom.

- **2008-2009 FOCUS Academy.** In FY09, a federal personnel development grant provided \$372,090 for the 2008-2009 Massachusetts FOCUS Academy that is housed on MASSONE as an integrated statewide online professional development system. One hundred and eight-four educators in 54 districts participated in the fall 2008 course; the spring 2009 course enrollment is currently underway. This project provides online professional development on: 1) universal design for learning; 2) creating and sustaining positive school and classroom learning environments; 3) career development and competitive employment; 4) post-secondary education; 5) how to partner with families of middle and high school students with disabilities; 6) professional development for early intervention specialists and allied health workers; and 7) parent/professional leadership institutes

## **VI. Attachment B: M.G.L. Chapter 71 section 38Q**

### **Professional development plans; statewide assistance plan**

Section 38Q. Every school district in the commonwealth shall adopt and implement a professional development plan for all principals, teachers, other professional staff, paraprofessionals and teacher assistants employed by the district, to include the professional support teams established pursuant to section thirty-eight G, and annually shall update such plans and set forth a budget for professional development within the confines of the foundation budget. Said plan shall include training in the teaching of new curriculum frameworks and other skills required for the effective implementation of this act, including participatory decision making, and parent and community involvement. The plan shall also include training in: (1) analyzing and accommodating diverse learning styles of all students in order to achieve an objective of inclusion in the regular classroom of students with diverse learning styles; and (2) methods of collaboration among teachers, paraprofessionals and teacher assistants to accommodate such styles. The plan may also include training in the provision of pre-referral services within regular education. Said plan shall also include training for members of school councils, pursuant to section fifty-nine C. Said plan may include teacher training which addresses the effects of gender bias in the classroom. In any school district with limited English proficient students, the plan shall provide training for teachers in second language acquisition techniques for the re-certification of teachers and administrators. All professional development plans required by this section shall be filed annually with the commissioner of education.

The commissioner of education for the commonwealth shall prepare each year a plan for providing statewide assistance in the preparation and implementation of professional development plans. The plan shall include data that demonstrates, statewide and by school district, the types of professional development provided for educators who work with limited English proficient students. The commissioner shall consult with the board of higher education in developing said plan. This plan shall evaluate the feasibility of obtaining assistance from institutions of higher education and private service providers. The plan shall be submitted to the board of education for approval. A copy of said plan shall be submitted to the joint committee on education, arts, and humanities of the general court.